SEMINAR
REPORT

SELECTION OF CLANDESTINE TARGETS

IN THE DO

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF INTELLIGENCE

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

TR/SR 77-01

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF INTELLIGENCE IN OTR OPERATES
A RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION PROGRAM KEYED TO THE PROCESSES
AND FUNCTIONS OF INTELLIGENCE. THE OBJECTIVE OF THE CENTER
IS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE PROFESSIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND
TO THE RECORD OF THE ART OF INTELLIGENCE. RESEARCH PROJECTS
ARE UNDERTAKEN BY INTELLIGENCE "FELLOWS"––VOLUNTEER
OFFICERS FROM ACROSS THE AGENCY ON FULL–TIME DETAIL TO
THE CENTER. INQUIRIES ABOUT THE CENTER PROGRAM, OR COMMENTS
ON THIS REPORT ARE INVITED BY THE DIRECTOR/CSI, EXTENSION 2193.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF INTELLIGENCE

3 February 1977

Seminar Report: The Selection of Clandestine Targets in the
Directorate of Operations

A group of thirteen experienced DO officers gathered on
16 December 1976 under the Center's auspices to discuss the
problems and needs, strengths and weaknesses of the present
Directorate systems for the selection of clandestine targets.

The group, which was by chance more representative of the
staffs than the line divisions, concluded that the present
system of targeting is a fairly effective one that does not
err seriously in achieving its objectives. Nevertheless, it
noted several significant issues affecting the process. The
key issue, the group overwhelmingly agreed, is how to distin-
guish between what can be obtained overtly and what must be
collected covertly by human sources. Although the discussion
ranged widely across many aspects of the process, this issue
repeatedly emerged as critical.

Apart from this difficulty, other significant problems
impeding the effective operation of the targeting system today
include the "no surprises dictum," the continuing overemphasis
on the collection of intelligence on insignificant targets, an
inadequate appreciation, especially by requestors, of overtly
available information, and the lack of any uniform set of
measurements with which to validate the worth of and need for

clandestine collection. The initial section of this paper

describes the discussion on these impediments, while later

sections deal with the targeting system itself in some detail.

Problems Faced in the Targeting System

Of the impediments to the smooth working of the present

system, probably the sharpest posed by the participants was

that of the "no surprises" dictum. This is the concept under

which station chiefs are expected to collect whatever informa-

tion is necessary to prevent the U.S. from being surprised by

a foreign development potentially important to U.S. interests.

This collection effort is to be maintained regardless of the

specific targeting priorities of the station. The application

of this dictum tends to complicate efforts to move in the

direction of narrowing and sharpening the targets for

clandestine human collection, especially against soft targets --

where the Agency is already viewed as spread too thin, and

where the difficulties of determining what can be collected

overtly as opposed to covertly are most severe. One participant

believes we collect entirely too much information, and then

disseminate it, simply because our field officers are under

the "no surprises" dictum and dare not relax a full grasp of the

local political scene even though other Agencies and Departments

should be responsible for reporting those developments.

In this connection several participants bemoaned the

refusal of the Department of State to task its foreign service

officers with reporting responsibilities, although the Department's recent selection of one reporting coordination officer to work outside of INR is viewed as a promising move in the right direction. Some expressed the view that we are too much haunted by the "no surprises" dictum to set about trimming our sails down to a really effective collection effort. Two of the participants claimed that collection against soft targets will be narrowed and refined as budgetary and other pressures increase. The implication was that unless we get our priorities straight on the "no surprises" dictum, this refinement process will be needlessly disorganized and possibly ineffective.

The second problem is that of assuring that the line is held against the collection of insignificant information. Some of the participants opined that there is an inordinate interest by users in questions of relatively minor importance to national interests, even by high officials on occasion and more often by analysts who suddenly have an interest in, or an assignment to write about, some subject of distinctly secondary significance. In the view of the participants, these analysts needlessly generate targeting on less-than-essential collection. One participant argued for formalizing all requirements on the DO through the Requirements Branch of the Intelligence Control Group of the DO Policy and Coordination Staff to minimize this problem. While this would tend to screen out less important requests, it would also undercut the

flexibility and real-life responsiveness of the more commonly
used "informal" system described later in this paper. The
number of formal requirements levied on the DO in the past few
years has declined and now appears to be steadying at a more
manageable level.

A third problem faced in the targeting process is that
of a thorough appreciation of the overtly available information.
Some participants believed that it is the responsibility of the
analyst to know all the potential and actual sources of overt
information on his specialty, but the participants complained
that too frequently the analyst does not care how he gets the
information he wants, and when faced with an inability to
command overt collection, turns to the clandestine service
saying he could not get the information overtly. This raises
the question whether it is necessary in this age of exploding
information sources to create a bureaucratic and community-wide
structure to ferret out overtly available information and then
assemble it for the analyst. While a part of a draft National
Foreign Intelligence Plan for Human Resources (NPHRC) being
developed by the Human Resources Committee (HRC), described
later in this paper, does not go this far it at least envisions
identifying all overt sources of intelligence on selected topics.
It should certainly be the responsibility of any good DO
reports or case officer to know the overtly available information
on the subject on which he is working. The working assumption

seems to be that he does, as the separation of overtly available from covertly collectible is most frequently made by the line officers of the DO Divisions in consultation with either the requestor or the Requirements Branch. Although all participants in the seminar were not unanimous in the degree of confidence they expressed in the capabilities of the line officers to do this, the majority believed they did have the capacity.

The last of the problems facing the targeting system discussed by the group was the lack of a uniform set of measurements by which to validate both the worth of and the need for clandestine collection. While the Requirements Branch attempts to bring together a meeting of the minds on both points with formal requests, and usually succeeds in doing so, it is not staffed with professionals in every field and cannot act as the court of last resort on serious basic disputes. Furthermore, it does not handle a myriad of the collection requests informally levied on the DO. Too rarely, thought the participants, is a clear declaration made by Agency authorities that the information can be collected overtly and therefore should not be collected by clandestine means--especially if it is not presently being overtly collected. Who is empowered to make such a declaration? The collector has a difficult time saying no, when an analyst says, "I need the information and I can't get it from those who could be collecting overtly because they are not doing so now, and are

unwilling to do so in the future." Whether the new NPHRC

system that provides a community input will ever approach a

solution to this is in question, as the NPHRC will treat with

selected areas of need only and, to succor community cooperation

and participation, will have no directive power over individual

agency or departmental targeting.

How the System Works

The group began its discussion on the targeting system

itself by focusing on the operation of the formal and informal

elements that make it up. One question to be asked is whether

the process is flexible enough to meet changing targeting needs.

The participants, in general, agree that it is. It is noted

that the system was of sufficient health to accommodate the

rather drastic functional change in our targeting over the past

five years during which collection efforts were effectively

redirected toward such subjects as terrorism, economics, narcotics,

and regional and raw material organizations. A parallel demonstra-

tion of flexibility has taken place in connection with harder

targets in the denied areas of the world where our targeting has

become more refined and precise.

In maintaining this flexibility, the participants concluded

that the informal part of the process was the most important to

targeting. This system, which seems to handle the larger

proportion of the targets, is engaged when one analyst (either

within or outside CIA) contacts a line divisional officer of

the DO, usually a reports officer, to indicate an interest in

6

acquiring some specific intelligence information. One of the
major strengths of this system, in the opinion of some of the
participants, is the opening it provides for a fairly frank
and explicit discussion of sources and collection capabilities
-- subjects that would never be committed to print and circulation
because of the security risks involved. There are occasions when
this system results in a formalizing of the request through the
Requirements Branch, but this is not the result of the majority
of the informal targeting discussions which take place.

When the formal requirements system is engaged through
the Requirements Branch, the Branch consults with the line
divisional officers involved first to determine whether the
information is worth collecting and second whether the information
is collectible by overt means. It they determine it is both,
the request is usually directed to the Domestic Collection
Division, or the requestor may be referred to the Department
of State or other overt collectors of foreign information. The
formal launching of a request for intelligence through this
system from within the Agency also encompasses close coordination
with the Human Sources Group, Requirements and Evaluation Staff
(RES/HSG) of the Comptrollers Office, which replaced the Collection
Guidance and Assessments Staff (CGAS). The RES/HSG acts as a
representative of the producing_elements of the Agency. (Indeed
requirements may come to the DO through RES/HSG. According to
one participant, RES/HSG is eager to take a longer view of

requirements, anticipating needs rather than reacting to crises.)

Internal Guidance: the Objectives

Despite the reliance on the informal part of the targeting process, individual DO officers are not working in a vacuum without general formal guidance on where the clandestine effort should be directed. The established system for the direction of operational effort is the DO objectives. In formulating these, the DCI objectives, the DCI "Perspectives" document, and the Key Intelligence Questions (KIQs) as well as other community guidance documents are consulted. The DO objectives, insofar as clandestine targeting is concerned, work the direct reverse of accepted Management by Objective (MBO) principles. Instead of being developed from the bottom up, as good MBO doctrine requires, the DO objectives are set from the top down. This was considered by the participants to be the right way to do it. The DCI objectives are translated into DO objectives, which in turn are translated into objectives for each of the overseas stations. Theoretically, at least, the documents from which the DO objectives are developed reflect inputs from the intelligence community's customers and from the producers of finished intelligence -- i.e., the parties who should be setting both the substance and the priorities.

The danger of targeting from the bottom up would be in
letting assets rather than needs drive the system. That needs
do drive the system is obvious when one considers the tremen-
dous premium placed upon recruitment of new sources (in con-
trast to the exploitation of existing ones) and the heavier
weighting given to hard as opposed to soft targeting. Also
assisting in keeping the system focused upon the right
targeting is the reports evaluation system which grades the
intelligence reports as they come in. Those which are not
responsive to the objectives tend to get lower grades and
this in turn discourages further pursuit of that line of
information. Rewards (high grades) for on-target reporting
complete the process of maintaining discipline in the entire
system.

External Guidance: the Focus Program and Others

Among the specific external elements contributing to the
targeting process for clandestine human collection, are the
FOCUS Review Program of the DCI Human Resources Committee,
the Key Intelligence Questions (KIQ) system of the Intelligence
Community, the DCID 1/2 which sets priorities, and finally,
the nascent NPHRC.

The FOCUS program, which provides systematic reviews of
reporting by human collectors stationed in diplomatic missions
abroad, produced mixed reviews from participants. Those who
believed FOCUS reviews were helpful pointed out that in FOCUS
Thailand, the review had assisted in sharpening station clan-
destine human targeting. This specific report suggested ways
of eliminating that which was not needed and placing more
emphasis upon that which was needed. There are similar
examples in other reports. It was noted, however, that the
current emphasis of FOCUS is on reviewing the full spectrum
of human source reporting. FOCUS does not now deal with the
methods of collection--overt versus covert.

The Department of State actively supports the FOCUS pro-
gram, and State is expected to propose that the Current
Intelligence Requirements Lists (CIRLs) be terminated except
for the USSR, the PRC, North Korea, and Eastern Europe.
State may propose an expansion of the FOCUS program to
include the most important overseas missions every two years
(approximately 40 countries). Most participants agreed that
FOCUS assessments tend to bring to the attention of senior
officers corrections and adjustments that need to be made in
targeting. One participant voiced his view that a serious
flaw in the current FOCUS approach was the tendency of each
department/agency to evaluate its own contribution and to
protect itself in FOCUS reports. There is too much emphasis
on what was being done well rather than on areas of weakness.

10

The Key Intelligence Question system is also useful to
the individual DO officer in targeting for clandestine col-
lection. The KIQ strategy sessions were highly praised by
one of the line DO officers participating in the seminar.
He said these sessions gathered the specialists on the sub-
ject from the entire community who could among themselves
quickly and effectively focus on gaps in information and on
which agency was best equipped to cover those gaps. There
are, however, some limiting factors to be considered in
evaluating the KIQ contribution to DO targeting efforts.
The KIQs are selective and not all-inclusive of total needs.
The KIQ Evaluation Process (KEP) was dropped because it did
not work, which eliminated a theoretically useful means to
measure how effective KIQs are, inter alia, in targeting
clandestine human assets on vital information gaps.

A collateral activity originally under one of the National
Intelligence Officers was given very high praise by all in
attendance, that of the Pilot Collection Program (PCP). (This
activity is coordinated by the former NIO for Special Activi-
ties, now designated the Special Assistant for Strategic
Intelligence in the Comptrollers Office.) There are four
PCPs presently envisioned: ████████████████████████ 25X1C
████████████████████████████████████ 25X1C
Two are already activated and appear to be ideal techniques
for bringing to bear all of the assets of the Intelligence
Community on a specific selected target--with emphasis upon

11

CONFIDENTIAL

maximum collection by other than clandestine human means.
DCD and the overt exchange programs of ERDA are very much
exploited in the first two PCP processes, which those involved
consider extremely effective.

One external program that assists the DO officers in
their clandestine targeting is the prioritizing of intelli-
gence needs that is done in the annual update to the DCID 1/2.
Although some proposed alterations in the DCID 1/2 had been
suggested in the issues paper for the seminar, those who
expressed an opinion did not believe that any attempt should
be made to alter the DCID 1/2 in order to assist in targeting.
DCID 1/2 was viewed as useful for the broad guidance on how our
priorities should be ranked and as necessary for the SIGINT
and Imagery disciplines as well as the human one.

A Coordinated Community Voice

A nascent program to develop community-driven collection
guidance and requirements for human source collection is
underway in the DCI's Human Resources Committee (HRC). This
would go beyond the consulting of DCI "Perspectives," Objectives,
and the KIQs earlier noted as an input to the formulation of
DO objectives. The program is being developed to fill several
needs which have long been recognized in the intelligence
community, among them the fact that the community does not
have an authoritative and comprehensive requirements system
in operation for human collection of intelligence, either
overt or covert.

The DCI attached much importance to the issues addressed in this program. In his "Goals and Objectives for FY 1977" he discussed (on page 3) the need to assure that the input from non-intelligence entities is considered along with the availability of all other data in deliberations leading to the tasking of intelligence collection and production resources, and the need to optimize the use of overt collection means before resorting to more expensive clandestine or technical collection. The DCI reportedly was to make essentially the same points in his "Annual Report to the President and to Congress," and in his "Perspectives for Planning and Programming FY 1979-1983."

Under the community program, the HRC will examine defined national intelligence needs to determine their appropriateness for collection by human resources, after which appropriate guidance will be developed for collection managers. In developing this guidance the HRC is to give particular attention to: (a) the degree of consumer reliance on human source reporting relative to the need in question; (b) the foreign information holdings and collection capabilities of non-intelligence entities; and (c) the likelihood that overt collectors can obtain the needed information or, conversely, what clandestine collection input might be required. The program will augment and support the autonomous "foreign affairs community." Guidance concerning a given national

13

intelligence need may be developed solely for human resource collection or in conjunction with SIGINT and Imagery collection.

This HRC program is still in the conceptual stage of development, as one of the action programs in the draft NPHR currently being developed for DCI approval. Concern was expressed at the seminar as to whether this concept might be an unnecessary and bureaucratic encumbrance upon the present system. Some thought such matters could be handled better by the individual departments themselves.

The feelings of other participants who expressed themselves on this community input to clandestine targeting were more positive. They believed it was necessary and useful to the general effort to select the right targets and to narrow the scope of the targets that must be covered by clandestine human sourse collection.